

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
SAVANNAH DIVISION**

DONALD UBELE,)	
)	
Movant,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. CV412-136
)	CR405-012
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Donald Ubele has submitted for filing his second 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion attacking his 2006 conviction for firearms offenses. (Doc. 1); *see Ubele v. United States*, No. CV408-178 (S.D. Ga. May 21, 2010). Since this is a successive motion, Ubele must first “move in the appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the application.” 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2255(h) (cross-referencing § 2244 certification requirement). In fact, it appears that he meant to do so, since he filed this on an Eleventh Circuit successive motion application. But he is in the wrong court. This Court *must* dismiss second or successive petitions, without awaiting any response from the government, absent prior approval by the court of appeals. *Levert v. United States*, 280 F. App’x 936, 936 (11th Cir. 2008)

(per curiam) (“Without authorization, the district court lacks jurisdiction to consider a second or successive petition.”); *Hill v. Hopper*, 112 F.3d 1088, 1089 (11th Cir. 1997) (same); *In re Medina*, 109 F.3d 1556, 1561 (11th Cir. 1997); *Nunez v. United States*, 96 F.3d 990, 991 (7th Cir. 1996).

Because Ubele has filed this latest § 2255 motion without prior Eleventh Circuit approval, this Court is without jurisdiction to consider it. Consequently, it should be **DISMISSED** as successive. Applying the Certificate of Appealability ("COA") standards set forth in *Brown v. United States*, 2009 WL 307872 at * 1-2 (S.D. Ga. Feb. 9, 2009) (unpublished), the Court discerns no COA-worthy issues at this stage of the litigation, so no COA should issue. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1); see *Alexander v. Johnson*, 211 F.3d 895, 898 (5th Cir. 2000) (approving *sua sponte* denial of COA before movant filed a notice of appeal). And, as there are no non-frivolous issues to raise on appeal, an appeal would not be taken in good faith. Thus, *in forma pauperis* status on appeal should likewise be **DENIED**. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

SO REPORTED AND RECOMMENDED this 13th day of June, 2012.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA